



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/763,395

01/26/2004

Woong Kwon

277/030

4580

27849 7590 07/16/2007

LEE & MORSE, P.C.

3141 FAIRVIEW PARK DRIVE

SUITE 500

FALLS CHURCH, VA 22042

EXAMINER

BEHNCKE, CHRISTINE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3661

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/16/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/763,395

Applicant(s)

KWON ET AL.

Examiner

Christine M. Behncke

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-10, 12-16 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 11 and 17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☒ Other: Non-Patent literature

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the Amendment and Remarks filed 6 April 2007, in which claims 1-20 were presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jinichi, JP 2001-138272, in view of Adachi et al., "Mechanism and Control of a Leg-Wheel Hybrid Mobile Robot", Proceedings of the 1999 IEEE/RSJ, 1999 IEEE.

(Claims 1, 7, and 13) Jinichi discloses an ambulatory robot and method including a lower body having two or more legs and an upper body part installed on an upper end of the lower body part and capable of performing positional displacement by moving the lower body part (Figures 6 and 7), the ambulatory robot comprising: rotating means installed on a bottom surface of each of the two or more legs (Figure 4); and control means for controlling a motion of the ambulatory robot using the lower and upper body parts ([0038]), wherein the control means controls a speed of revolution of the rotating means ([0040]), and controls the motion of the ambulatory robot so that the positional displacement of the ambulatory robot is performed by any of running, walking and

Art Unit: 3661

sliding, depending on the controlled speed of revolution ([0073]-[0074]). Jinichi further discloses wherein the robot is able to walk up stairs, skid over floor surfaces, but does not disclose detecting the slope of a floor. However, Adachi et al. teaches control of a hybrid mobile robot that includes slope-detection means for sensing a slope of a floor (ultrasonic range sensor mounted on active sensor arm) and control the speed of the robot motion based on the detected slope of the floor (paragraph 4.2). Adachi et al. clearly is teaching the benefits of wheels, fast and efficient on flat terrain but cannot efficiently move on discontinuous terrain, and legs that move inherently slower (paragraph 1, lines 15-24) even on flat terrain but can negotiate obstacles and slopes.

(Claims 2, 8 and 14) Adachi further teaches decelerating means for slowing the speed of revolution of the rotating means, wherein the control means controls the decelerating means thereby controlling the speed of revolution of the rotating means (locking the front wheels, paragraph 3).

(Claims 3, 9 and 15) Adachi further teaches wherein the control means controls the decelerating means so that the speed of revolution slows to zero when the slope of the floor sensed by the slope-detection means is greater than a first preset angle (paragraph 4.2).

(Claims 4, 10 and 16) Adachi further teaches wherein the control means controls the motion of the robot so that the positional displacement of the robot is performed by walking when the speed of revolution equals zero (walking up steps, paragraph 4.2, figure 7).

(Claims 6, 12 and 18) Adachi and Jinichi teach wherein the rotating means comprises two or more wheels (figure 1 for Adachi, drawing 14 for Jinichi).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Adachi et al. with the robot of Jinichi because, as Adachi et al. suggests, detecting the slope of the floor surface and obstacles such as steps allows the robot to adapt physically to the environment, as Adachi's does by increasing traction by braking/locking the front wheels to increase stabilization over uneven ground (paragraphs 4.2 and 5). The detection of discontinuous ground allows the robot to effectively negotiate flat terrain quickly, and lock the front wheel to create a stable leg when moving on a steep slope to slow the descent by generating more traction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jinichi in view of Adachi et al. as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Takenaka et al., US 2003/0114960.

Jinichi et al. in view of Adachi et al. teaches an ambulatory robot that senses the slope of a ground surface, however Adachi teaches the use of an ultrasonic range sensor to determine the altitude of the surrounding terrain (paragraph 3) wherein the sensor is located in an arm, the purpose of this location is to further identify obstacles in the robot's path. A sensor is not located in the foot. However, Takenaka et al. teaches a walking mobile robot that estimates the inclination of the ground by the detected foot to floor reaction force detected by a Foot Floor Reaction Sensor 108 located in the foot of

Art Unit: 3661

the ambulatory robot (figure 2). Takenaka teaches that it was well known in the prior art to use an inclinometer in the foot of the robot to determine the inclination of the floor surface ([0004]-[0007]). Takenaka does not specify which type of inclinometers were used in the foot of the robot, however it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a liquid or bubble inclinometer in the foot as well as any other available inclinometer to determine the slope of the floor surface. Takenaka et al. further suggests it would have been obvious to position the inclinometer in the foot of the robot to determine the inclination of the surface at the point of landing to feedback and adjust for posture stabilization ([0007], [0009]).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5, 11, and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christine M. Behncke whose telephone number is (571) 272-8103. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am- 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas G. Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3661

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

CMB



THOMAS BLACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER